

**REMARKS**

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 14 and 23 have been amended to further define the invention. Claims 32-35 have been added. Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow.

In a response to the First Office Action (dated October 17, 2002) that was mailed October 16, 2002, a Proposed Changes to the Drawings was filed in which amendments were proposed to Figures 1-6. In the Final Office Action dated December 18, 2002, the Examiner did not indicate whether the proposed changes to the drawings were accepted. Approval of the proposed drawing changes is hereby respectfully requested.

On February 25, 2003, Applicant's attorney, Jean M. Tibbetts, conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Mylinh Tran to discuss the substance of the final office action as well as the substance of Prior Art References Rock, U.S. Patent No. 6,032,120 and Wong, U.S. Patent No. 6,260,021. The amendments to the independent claims 1, 14 and 23 in the present response are intended to reflect the outcome of the telephone interview by further clarifying the "workstation configured to operate the first application and the second application" and the "second application configured to display patient data based on the patient context" claim limitations. Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct the interview. On March 3, 2003, in a telephone conversation between Examiner Tran and Applicant's attorney, the Examiner indicated that the amendments to independent claims 1, 14 and 23 in the present response appear to overcome the §103(a) rejection based on the cited references Rock and Wong.

**1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rock et al. ("Rock"; U.S. Pat. No. 6,032,120) in view of Wong et al. ("Wong"; U.S. Pat. No. 6,260,021)

**A. Allowability of Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2-13**

Claim 1 has been amended to further define the invention. The invention as defined by amended claim 1 requires, among other elements, a workstation configured to operate both the first application and the second application that reside on the workstation and a second application configured to display patient data on the display unit based on the patient context. As discussed in the specification, patient context information is shared between a first application and a second application operating on a single workstation. See, Specification, page 2, lines 4-5, page 4, lines 8-13 and page 7, lines 4-8. The second application is configured to display patient data on the display unit based on the patient context provided by the first application. See, Specification, page 8, lines 5-12. Accordingly, the patient data information system allows multiple applications residing on the same workstation to exchange patient context data. See, Specification, pages 7, lines 4-8 and lines 19-22.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the difference between Rock and claim 1 is “a workstation coupled to a display unit.” See Final Office Action, page 3, lines 2-4. Wong was cited as teaching a workstation. See Final Office Action, page 3, lines 4-5. It is respectfully submitted, however, that neither Rock nor Wong, in combination or separately, teaches or suggests the combination of limitations in amended claim 1, in particular, neither reference teaches or suggests a workstation configured to operate both the first application and the second application that reside on the workstation where the second application is configured to display patient data on the display unit based on the patient context provided from the first application.

In contrast, Rock discloses a client application on a client device that sends a request to a server application on a server device to send digital medical image(s) associated with a medical study to the client application. See Rock, Figure 1, col. 1, lines 48-62 and col. 2, lines 31-33 and lines 45-67. The client device and the server device are each hardware components (such as a CPU) used run the corresponding software applications. See Rock, col. 2, lines 61-67. The server application *locates* the requested medical study and *sends* a digital medical image to the client application which is used to display the digital medical image on a display

of the client device. See Rock, col. 2, lines 45-67. The server application, however, is not configured to display patient data based on the request from the client application.

Further, while Wong does disclose workstations 22, 30, 38 (See, Wong, Figure 1, col. 7, lines 12-15, lines 33-37 and lines 59-62) in the context of a system and method of distributing medical images, Wong does not teach or suggest the other limitations missing from Rock, specifically, a first application and a second application that reside on the same workstation where the second application is configured to display patient data based on the patient context provided by the first application. Rather, Wong teaches that the disclosed three tiered system advantageously allows a client system (or workstation 38) of the third tier to run only a single client software that interacts with the provided common format and structure of the middleware of the system to access data from diverse PAC and/or RI systems. See Wong, col. 3 lines 30-41.

The combination of Rock and Wong does not result in the subject matter recited in amended claim 1 because neither Rock nor Wong, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a first application and a second application residing on the same workstation where the second application is configured to display patient data based on the patient context provided by the first application. Accordingly, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is allowable over Rock in view of Wong.

Claims 2-13 depend from amended claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Rock in view of Wong for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1-13 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 1-13 is respectfully requested.

**B. Allowability of Independent Claim 14 and Dependent Claims 15-22**

Claim 14 has been amended to further define the invention. The invention as defined by amended claim 14 requires, among other limitations, first and second applications residing on a single workstation and displaying a second set of patient data using the second

application on the workstation based on the patient context from the first application. As discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, the second application is configured to display patient data on the display unit based on the patient context provided by the first application. See, Specification, page 8, lines 5-12. The patient data information system allows multiple applications residing on the same workstation to exchange patient context data. See, Specification, pages 7, lines 4-8 and lines 19-22.

In contrast, neither Rock nor Wong, in combination or separately, teaches or suggests first and second applications residing on a single workstation and displaying a second set of patient data using the second application on the workstation based on the patient context from the first application. Rather, as discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, Rock discloses a client application on a client device that sends a request to a server application on a server device to send digital medical image(s) associated with a medical study to the client application. See Rock, Figure 1, col. 1, lines 48-62 and col. 2, lines 31-33 and lines 45-67. The client device and the server device are each hardware components (such as a CPU) used run the corresponding software applications. See Rock, col. 2, lines 61-67. The server application *locates* the requested medical study and *sends* a digital medical image to the client application which is used to display the digital medical image on a display of the client device. See Rock, col. 2, lines 45-67. The server application, however, is not configured to display patient data based on the request from the client application.

Further, while Wong does disclose workstations 22, 30, 38 (See, Wong, Figure 1, col. 7, lines 12-15, lines 33-37 and lines 59-62) in the context of a system and method for distributing medical images, Wong does not teach or suggest the other limitations missing from Rock, specifically, first and second applications residing on a single workstation and displaying a second set of patient data using the second application on the workstation based on the patient context from the first application. As discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, Wong teaches that the disclosed three tiered system advantageously allows a client system (or workstation 38) of the third tier to run only a single client software that interacts with the provided common format and structure of the middleware of the system to access data from diverse PAC and/or RI systems. See Wong, col. 3 lines 30-41.

The combination of Rock and Wong does not result in the subject matter recited in amended claim 14 because neither Rock nor Wong, either separately or together, teaches or suggests first and second applications residing on a single workstation and displaying a second set of patient data using the second application on the workstation based on the patient context from the first application. Accordingly, it is submitted that amended claim 14 is allowable over Rock in view of Wong.

Claims 15-22 depend from amended claim 14 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 14 and are therefore allowable over Rock in view of Wong for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 14.

Accordingly, claims 14-22 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 14-22 is respectfully requested.

**C. Allowability of Independent Claim 23 and Dependent Claims**

24-31

Claim 23 has been amended to further define the invention. The invention as defined by amended claim 23 requires, among other limitations, first and second applications residing on a single workstation and means for displaying a second set of patient data using the second application on the workstation based on the patient context from the first application. As discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, the second application is configured to display patient data on the display unit based on the patient context provided by the first application. See, Specification, page 8, lines 5-12. The patient data information system allows multiple applications residing on the same workstation to exchange patient context data. See, Specification, pages 7, lines 4-8 and lines 19-22.

In contrast, as discussed above with respect to amended claims 1 and 14, neither Rock nor Wong, in combination or separately, teaches or suggests first and second applications residing on a single workstation and means for displaying a second set of patient data using the second application on the workstation based on the patient context from the first application. Accordingly, for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to amended claims 1 and 14, amended claim 23 is allowable over Rock in view of Wong.

Claims 24-31 depend from amended claim 23 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 23 and are therefore allowable over Rock in view of Wong for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 23.

Accordingly, claims 23-31 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 23-31 is respectfully requested.

**2. New Claims 32-35**

New independent claim 32 and dependent claims 33-35 have been added to the application.

New independent claim 32 is directed towards a patient data information workstation that includes a first application configured to retrieve and display patient images for a patient on a display and to generate patient context data associated with the patient and a second application in data communication with the first application. The second application is configured to receive the patient context data from the first application and to retrieve and display patient data for the patient on a display based on the patient context data. As discussed above with respect to amended claims 1, 14 and 23, neither Rock nor Wong, in combination or separately, teaches or suggests a workstation having a first application and a second application where the second application retrieves and displays patient data based on patient context data provided by the first application. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to amended claims 1, 14 and 23, claim 32 is allowable over Rock in view of Wong.

Claims 33-35 depend from claim 32 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 32 and are therefore allowable over Rock in view of Wong for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 32. Accordingly, claims 32-35 are believed to be allowable.

**3. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, entry of the amendments and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3/17/03

By Jean M. Tibbetts

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Suite 3800  
777 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-5306  
Telephone: (414) 297-5531  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Jean M. Tibbetts  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,193